

REMARKS:

Reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested.

The status of the claims is as follows:

Amended:	1, 8, 9
Cancelled:	None
New:	16-23
Pending:	1-23
Allowed:	None

The three additional claims over those paid for in previous papers are paid for as set forth in an accompanying paper.

The claims have been amended to more clearly define the invention. Support for the amendments is either apparent, or is as described in the text below. Support for the reiterated recitations of flexibility can be found, for example, at 4:22-28. The recitation of reversibility follows from the teachings in the application of using the claimed film in producing pharmaceuticals and the like. Repetitive patterns are taught in the drawings and would be understood in the art as a preferred way to use the claimed films in production methods. The film thicknesses recited are described, for example, at 4:26-27. Recitations of being consumable are supported, for example, at 3:28-29. The correction to the discussion of Figure 3 reflects an obvious numbering mistake. No new matter is added.

Since one embodiment within, for example, claim 1, is a flexible conductive inlay film that is a conductive film laminated against dielectric, and since the specification teaches that this conductive film can be continuous, those of skill will recognize that “wherein the dielectric film electrically isolates the selected regions” means that the dielectric limits the powder-attractive field away from the selected regions.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1, 6 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), based on an assertion of anticipation by DiStefano, USP 5,558,928. Applicant respectfully traverses.

DiStefano teaches circuit board assemblies formed from multiple layers, including “interposers” that provide the elements cited in the Office Action. Interposers apparently facilitate electrical contacts in circuit board assemblies. The bulk of the described interposers is formed of “flowable” dielectric, such as partially cured epoxy (9:39-42). An interior element 42 is formed of a relatively high elastic modulus material, which elastic modulus is normally higher than that of the bulk of the interposers (10:18-23). Such a device, while it can be bent, is not flexible as claimed. Accordingly, the cited document does not, it is respectfully submitted, disclose the claimed invention.

Further Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1, 6 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), based on an assertion of anticipation by Zohni, USP 6,380,060. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Zohni also teaches methods of placing solder balls on circuit board elements, including interposer elements (apparently such as taught by DiStefano) and “flexible dielectric sheet.” Apparently, the “flexible dielectric sheet” teaching is cited against the present claims. Nothing in the specification, however, teaches that the flexible dielectric sheets have, or should have, the detailed structures of the figures of Zohni. That it may be appropriate to place solder balls on “flexible dielectric sheet” is a completely different teaching than that such sheet should have the detailed structure of an interposer. Two-metal dielectric tape is used experimentally to test the method, but again this is not a teaching of a truly flexible tape with isolated regions as claimed. Instead, this teaching is only of making a pragmatic choice of a substrate for testing the method. All told, Applicant respectfully submits that Zohni teaches no more than DiStefano. Accordingly, Applicant’s prior argument is applicable here.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), based on an assertion of being unpatentable over Chrai, USP 6,303,143 in view of Zohni. Applicant respectfully traverses.

The rejection is believed to assert that it would be obvious to use conductive polymers taught by Zohni in the structure of Figure 15 of Chrai. Applicant respectfully submits that there is no motivation taught in the art for making this substitution. As to claim 8, there is no teaching of using the hypothetical structure in conjunction with an electrostatic chuck. Chrai teaches electrostatic chucks like that of Fig. 15 for attracting powder to substrates, but not using a Fig. 15 device with another Fig. 15 device. As to claim 9, Chrai does not teach or suggest incorporating part of the Fig. 15 device into a pharmaceutical. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection should be withdrawn.

Informality

The noted defect in the description of Figure 3 is corrected above.

Conclusion

In light of the above discussion and amendments, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.²

Respectfully submitted,



Arthur E. Jackson
Registration No. 34,354



A Pennsylvania Limited Liability Partnership
Princeton Pike Corporate Center
PO Box 5218
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5218
Allen Bloom (609) 620-3214
Arthur E. Jackson (609) 620-3254
Fax: (609) 620-3259
Attention: Arthur E. Jackson

² **FEE DEFICIENCY**

IF ANY ADDITIONAL EXTENSION IS REQUIRED, PLEASE CONSIDER THIS PAPER A PETITION FOR SUCH AN EXTENSION; ANY FEE FOR THE EXTENSION REQUIRED FOR CONSIDERATION OF THIS PAPER BUT NOT ENUMERATED ABOVE OR IN A TRANSMITTAL OR OTHER ASSOCIATED PAPER CAN BE CHARGED TO ACCOUNT NO. 04-0480.

AND/OR

IF ANY ADDITIONAL FEE IS REQUIRED FOR CONSIDERATION OF THIS PAPER, PLEASE CHARGE ACCOUNT NO. 04-0480.